

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. No claims have been amended by way of this response. However, a complete listing of the claims is provided hereinabove or the Examiner's convenience. Claim 1 is independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Specification

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's assistance with respect to the title of the invention. This objection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended the title of the invention as suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action. Accordingly, this objection has been obviated and/or rendered moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-22, 24, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Baron (U.S. Patent No. 6,459,388). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of the unique combination of limitation(s) of the claimed invention. For example, the prior art of record does not appear to teach or suggest the feature of: "display means for superposing and displaying a recommended composition image represented by said

desired, recommended composition data and an image represented by said image data.”
Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has indicated that Baron utilizes a display to depict site information, directions, weather and image data (e.g., recommended composition data) and a tour guide video. However, an image that is taken and the recommended composition data are not displayed on the same screen, e.g., simultaneously. In the claimed invention, a recommended composition data and an image represented by the image data are superposed and displayed on the same screen. Baron does not appear to teach or suggest this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 23 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as being unpatentable over Baron in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,670). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed in greater detail hereinabove, the primary reference relied upon by the Examiner fails to anticipate claim 1 as originally suggested by the Examiner. Since the remaining references of the prior art of record fail to teach or suggest the deficiencies of the Baron reference identified hereinabove, Applicants submit that this rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

Applicants respectfully petition under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and § 1.17 for a two-month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of **\$450.00** is attached hereto.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact Matthew T. Shanley, Registration No. 47,074 at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

MSW/MTS/cl
2091-0238P